

REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his findings and observations.

5 2. It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend Claim 3 solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In making such cancellations and amendments, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection to which Applicant considers the invention herein to be entitled.
10 Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

3. Claims 1, 11, 12, 13, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S. C. § 102(e) as
15 being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,870,559 ("Leshem"). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding Claim 1: The Examiner relies on Col. 18, line 22 to line 45 of Leshem as teaching "determining categories for found information by analyzing the content of the
20 information." Leshem describes a software system for analyzing and mapping web sites. The cited teaching describes a series of plug-ins that interact with the program core to give it enhanced functionality. Each plug-in performs a different function:

- Fixing broken hyperlinks;
- Retrieving and evaluating server log files to generate Web site activity data;

- Generating tests;
- Generating test scripts; and
- Visual display of search engine results.

5 The first, third and fourth functions have absolutely nothing to do with “determining categories” or “analyzing content.” The second function, retrieving and evaluating server log files to generate Web site activity data, does involve analysis of the file contents. However, the analysis is performed not to determine categories for found information, but to generate activity data for the web site being mapped.

10

The fifth function involves including dynamically-generated content within a site map by “capturing the output of a standard Web browser when a form is submitted by the user, and then automatically resubmitting this output during subsequent mappings of the site.” Thus, the “Search meter” merely recreates the functionality of the web site being mapped, displaying information that would have been displayed when the form from the web site being mapped was submitted. There is no analysis of information and no determination of categories.

15

20 Accordingly, the cited teaching has nothing to do with “determining categories for found information by analyzing the content of the information” because there is no determination of categories nor is there any analysis of information content. What the reference describes is a plurality of plug-ins, each having its own function, wherein none of those functions involves anything that remotely resembles or

suggests "determining categories for found information by analyzing the content of the information."

5 The Examiner next relies on Col. 9, line 56 to line 68 as teaching "correlating the categories with images that represent the categories," finding that object types are the same as the categories described in the first step of Claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The categories previously referred to are determined according to the object's content. One having an ordinary level of skill in the art would understand the term "content" to mean the subject matter or information
10 content of an object, rather than its type or format. Content can be defined as "the 'meat' of a document, as opposed to its format or appearance." Microsoft Corp., *Microsoft Computer Dictionary*, 109 (4th ed., Microsoft Press 1999). The first step of Claim 1, "determining categories for found information by analyzing the content of the information," is rendered completely pointless if it is followed by a step of
15 correlating the categories with images that represent object type. Displaying the various objects according to object type, or format, reveals nothing about the content of the object – a JPEG is a JPEG, a text file is a text file. There is thus no teaching or suggestion in Leshem of "correlating the categories with images that represent the categories," wherein the categories are determined according to content of the
20 information.

The Examiner next relies on Col. 9, line 56 to line 68 of Leshem as teaching "displaying images that correspond to the categories." Applicant respectfully disagrees. While Leshem does describe use of icons to denote object type in a

map of a web site, there is no teaching or suggestion in Leshem of a method of presenting a search result wherein images are displayed that correspond to categories of found information, the categories determined according to content of the found information.

5

The Examiner next relies on Col. 10, line 15 to line 36 of Leshem as teaching "wherein images corresponding to the found information are displayed when a user activates one of the categories." Applicant respectfully disagrees. The teaching cited by the Examiner describes the method of navigating the site map. The user
10 activates a 'zoom-in button' and then selects a portion of the site map. In response, the application resizes the selected portion. There is no activation of one of the categories. Rather, the user resizes a portion or area of interest using a selection tool. Furthermore, Leshem provides no "images corresponding to the found information." As shown in Figure 3 of Leshem, the individual objects are denoted by
15 the generic type icons previously described, supplemented by an annotation giving the object name. Thus, there is no teaching in Leshem of "images corresponding to the found information."

In view of the above, Application deems the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S. C. §
20 102(e) and all Claims depending therefrom to be improper.

Regarding Claim 3: The Examiner relies on Col. 10, line 26 to line 48 of Leshem as teaching "wherein the user activates one of the categories by dragging a cursor over the image that corresponds to the category." Applicant respectfully disagrees. What

Leshem actually describes is retrieval of one of the of the specified object by double-clicking the icon.

5 Regarding Claim 4: The Examiner relies on Figure 4 of Leshem as teaching "wherein the display is a grid." Applicant respectfully disagrees. While Figure 4 does show a grid, what is being displayed is a list of URLs from the web site being mapped, rather than a search result, as in the Claim 4.

10 Regarding Claim 5: The Examiner relies on Col. 16, line 26 to line 48 of Leshem as teaching "wherein the information includes a plurality of web sites." Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited teaching describes the provision of filter buttons, activation of which allows the user to filter selected service or object types from the site map.

15 Regarding Claim 6: The Examiner relies on Figure 18 of Leshem as teaching "further including providing a rotating display of content from the web sites." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Figure 18 depicts a site map wherein portions of the map have been filtered using the filtering buttons described above. Col 27, line 50 to line 62.

20 Regarding Claim 7 : The Examiner relies on Col 10, line 1 to line 15 as teaching "providing a video display of content from the web sites." Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited teaching provides a table listing 'video' as one URL type for

which a generic icon is provided. There is no teaching in Leshem of "providing a video display of content from the web sites."

Regarding Claim 8: The Examiner relies on Col. 16, line 26 to line 48 as teaching
5 "rating each web site according to whether the web site includes image content that is relevant to textual content on the web site." Applicant respectfully disagrees. As above, the cited teaching describes how to navigate the site map. Right-clicking on an icon displays the underlying object's properties, however there is no teaching of
10 "rating each web site according to whether the web site includes image content that is relevant to textual content on the web site."

Regarding Claim 10: The Examiner relies on Col. 16, line 26 to line 48 as teaching
15 "wherein dynamically displaying content from the web sites includes showing representative images from the web site that correspond to textual content in the web site." Applicant respectfully disagrees. As above, the cited teaching describes the use of filter buttons to filter service or object types from the map. There is no teaching of dynamically displaying content from the web sites" or of "showing representative images from the web site that correspond to textual content in the web site."

20 Regarding Claims 11 and 12: The Examiner relies on the same rationale as that used for the rejection of Claim 1. As previously shown, there is no teaching in Leshem of "determining categories for found information by analyzing the content of the information; images that correspond to the categories; and generating a display

of images that correspond to the categories; wherein images corresponding to the found information are displayed when a user activates one of the categories."

Regarding Claim 13: As previously shown, the only textual analysis of information that occurs is analysis of log files to generate web site activity data. The Examiner relies on Col. 9, line 56 to line 68 as teaching "generating a signature based on said textual content." As previously shown, the cited teaching describes the application of generic icons according to object type. One having an ordinary level of skill would readily recognized that "textual content" and object type are completely distinct.

Furthermore, there is nothing in Leshem that remotely resembles "generating a signature." Because Leshem does not teach generation of a signature, Leshem also cannot teach "associating the textual content with image content according to said signature." Leshem teaches associating a generic type icon with an object according to its type. As previously shown, Leshem does not teach "displaying the image content to illustrate the information."

Regarding Claims 15 to 17: As previously shown, there is no teaching in Leshem of:

- wherein the image content is not included in the information;
- wherein metadata associated with the image content is correlated with the textual content according to said signature to determine the image content that is associated with the textual content; and
- wherein the information includes a web site.

Regarding Claims 20-21: The rejection of Claims 20-21 is improper for the same reasons that the rejection of Claim 13 is improper.

4. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
5 Leshem in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,467,026 ("Yamamoto"). In view of the foregoing,
there is no teaching or suggestion of the subject matter of Claim 9 in the references,
either separately or in combination. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 9 under 35
U.S.C. 103(a) is deemed to be improper.

10 5. Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Leshem in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,085,226 ("Yamamoto"). In view of the foregoing,
there is no teaching or suggestion of the subject matter of Claim 14 in the references,
either separately or in combination. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 14 under 35
U.S.C. 103(a) is deemed to be improper.

15

CONCLUSION

There being no outstanding issues remaining, the application is deemed to be in allowable condition. The Examiner is therefore earnestly requested to withdraw all
5 rejections, thus allowing the application to pass to issue as a United States Patent. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number given below.

10

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

15 Customer No. 22862